

Equal sums of like polynomials

T.D. Browning

Mathematical Institute, 24–29 St. Giles', Oxford OX1 3LB

browning@maths.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree d . We establish the paucity of non-trivial positive integer solutions to the equation

$$f(x_1) + f(x_2) = f(x_3) + f(x_4),$$

provided that $d \geq 7$. We also investigate the corresponding situation for equal sums of three like polynomials.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 11D45 (11P05)

1 Introduction

Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 3$, and let $B \geq 1$. Then for any $s \geq 2$ we define $M_s(f; B)$ to be the number of positive integers $x_1, \dots, x_{2s} \leq B$ such that

$$f(x_1) + \dots + f(x_s) = f(x_{s+1}) + \dots + f(x_{2s}). \quad (1)$$

It is conjectured that $M_s(f; B)$ is dominated by the $s!B^s$ trivial solutions, in which $x_1, \dots, x_s$ are a permutation of $x_{s+1}, \dots, x_{2s}$. We therefore define $M_s^{(0)}(f; B)$ to be the number of non-trivial solutions to (1). It is in the special case $f_0(x) = x^d$ that this quantity has received the most attention. Thanks to the work of numerous authors it is well known that

$$M_2^{(0)}(f_0; B) = o(B^2)$$

for any $d \geq 3$. Moreover, recent joint work of the author with Heath-Brown [1] has established the bound

$$M_3^{(0)}(f_0; B) = o(B^3)$$

for $d \geq 33$.

Returning to the more general quantity $M_s^{(0)}(f; B)$, it is only in the case $s = 2$ and $d = 3$ that the paucity of non-trivial solutions has been established. Indeed, using quite elementary means Wooley [7] has shown that

$$M_2^{(0)}(f; B) = O_{\varepsilon, f}(B^{5/3+\varepsilon}),$$

for any cubic polynomial f and any choice of $\varepsilon > 0$. The best that is known for polynomials of higher degree is the estimate $M_2^{(0)}(f; B) = O_{\varepsilon, f}(B^{2+\varepsilon})$, that follows from the trivial estimate $d(n) = O_\varepsilon(n^\varepsilon)$ for the divisor function. Our first result rectifies this situation somewhat for polynomials of sufficiently large degree.

Theorem 1. *Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 4$. Then we have*

$$M_2^{(0)}(f; B) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} B^{1+\varepsilon} \left(B^{1/3} + B^{2/\sqrt{d}+1/(d-1)} \right),$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular we have

$$M_2(f; B) = 2B^2(1 + o(1))$$

for $d \geq 7$, and

$$M_2^{(0)}(f; B) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} B^{4/3+\varepsilon}$$

for $d \geq 42$.

Apart from in the special case $f = f_0$ and $s = 3$, nobody has yet been able to establish the paucity of non-trivial solutions to (1) for any value of $s \geq 3$. The best available estimates arise from applications of Hua's inequality [3]. In the case $s = 3$ this provides the estimate

$$M_3(f; B) = O_{\varepsilon, f}(B^{7/2+\varepsilon}),$$

provided that f has degree $d \geq 3$. Our second result improves upon this estimate for polynomials of sufficiently large degree.

Theorem 2. *Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 4$. Then we have*

$$M_3^{(0)}(f; B) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} B^{3+\varepsilon} \left(B^{1/3} + B^{2/\sqrt{d}+1/(d-1)} \right),$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular we have

$$M_3(f; B) = o(B^{7/2})$$

for $d \geq 20$.

It would be of considerable interest to increase the range of d in Theorem 2's estimate for $M_3(f; B)$, for such progress would have applications to smooth Weyl differencing as employed by Vaughan and Wooley [6] to obtain further improvements in Waring's problem. In order to facilitate future investigations, it will be convenient to state the following hypothesis for given $\delta \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\theta_\delta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Hypothesis $[\delta, \theta_\delta]$. *Let $S \subset \mathbb{A}^3$ be a non-singular affine surface of degree $\delta \geq 2$, and let $S_\delta \subseteq S$ denote the subset formed by deleting all of the curves of degree at most $\delta - 2$ from S , that are defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then we have*

$$\#\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in S_\delta \cap \mathbb{Z}^3 : \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|, |x_3|\} \leq B\} \ll_{\varepsilon, \delta} B^{\theta_\delta + \varepsilon}.$$

It is worth underlining that the implied constant in this estimate is assumed to be independent of the coefficients of the polynomial defining S . It follows from an easy induction argument that Hypothesis $[\delta, 2]$ always holds, although we can actually do rather better than this. Indeed one can apply a result of Heath-Brown [2, Theorem 14] along much the same lines as in the proof of [2, Equation (1.15)], to deduce that Hypothesis $[\delta, 2/\sqrt{\delta} + 1/(\delta - 1)]$ holds. In order to prove Theorems 1 and 2 it will therefore suffice to establish the following result.

Theorem 3. *Assume that Hypothesis $[d, \theta_d]$ holds, and let $s \geq 2$. Then for any polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ of degree $d \geq 4$, we have*

$$M_s^{(0)}(f; B) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} B^{2s-3+\varepsilon} \left(B^{1/3} + B^{\theta_d} \right).$$

It should be highlighted that Theorem 3 is only interesting for $s = 2$ and $s = 3$, since for larger values of s it is beaten by Hua's inequality. We end this section by discussing the value of the implied constant in Theorem 3. As it stands the constant is clearly allowed to depend upon f in some way. Suppose once and for all that

$$f(x) = a_0 x^d + a_1 x^{d-1} + \cdots + a_d, \quad (2)$$

with $a_0, \dots, a_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a_0 > 0$. Then it is in fact possible to prove that the implied constant is independent of the coefficients of f whenever $a_1 = 0$, and that it depends at most upon d and the choice of $\varepsilon > 0$. We shall content ourselves with merely indicating at which points of the argument this sort of finer inequality can be retrieved.

Acknowledgement. This work was undertaken while the second author was supported by EPSRC grant number GR/R93155/01.

2 Proof of Theorem 3

Suppose that f is given by (2) and that $d \geq 4$. We begin the proof of Theorem 3 by noticing that

$$a_0^{d-1} d^d f(x) = (a_0 dx + a_1)^d + b_2 (a_0 dx + a_1)^{d-2} + \cdots + b_{d-1} (a_0 dx + a_1) + b_d,$$

for appropriate $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ depending upon a_i and d . Upon making the change of variables $y_i = a_0 dx_i + a_1$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2s$, we therefore obtain the equation

$$g(y_1) + \cdots + g(y_s) = g(y_{s+1}) + \cdots + g(y_{2s}) \quad (3)$$

from (1), where

$$g(y) = y^d + b_2 y^{d-2} + \cdots + b_{d-1} y. \quad (4)$$

This transformation has the effect of taking positive integer points not exceeding B to positive integer points not exceeding $O_f(B)$. We stress that this is the main point of the argument at which a necessary dependence upon the coefficients of f appears. Such a transformation is in fact unnecessary if $a_1 = 0$ in (2). We have therefore shown that

$$M_s^{(0)}(f; B) \leq M_s^{(0)}(g; cB), \quad (5)$$

for some constant $c > 0$ depending only upon f .

During the course of our argument, it will be necessary to handle the contribution from certain “almost trivial” solutions to (3) separately. Let $S_s(B)$ denote the contribution to $M_s^{(0)}(g; cB)$ from those $y_1, \dots, y_{2s}$ for which

$$\{y_1, \dots, y_s\} \cap \{y_{s+1}, \dots, y_{2s}\} = \emptyset,$$

and let $T_s(B)$ denote the remaining contribution. It follows that

$$M_s^{(0)}(g; cB) = S_s(B) + T_s(B). \quad (6)$$

Moreover, whenever the vector $(y_1, \dots, y_{2s})$ is counted by $T_s(B)$, we must have $y_i = y_j$ for some $1 \leq i \leq s < j \leq 2s$.

In order to estimate $S_s(B)$ and $T_s(B)$ we shall employ the following result due to Pila [4, Theorem A].

Lemma 1. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{A}^3$ be an absolutely irreducible affine curve of degree δ . Then we have*

$$\#\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^3 : \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|, |x_3|\} \leq B\} \ll_{\varepsilon, \delta} B^{1/\delta + \varepsilon}.$$

As in the statement of Hypothesis $[\delta, \theta_\delta]$ the implied constant in Lemma 1 is understood to be independent of the coefficients of the polynomials defining C .

2.1 Estimating $S_s(B)$

In this section we provide an estimate for $S_s(B)$. This constitutes the main part of our argument. The idea will simply be to count points on the affine surfaces obtained by fixing values of $y_4, \dots, y_{2s}$ in (3). Let

$$\epsilon_i = \begin{cases} -1, & i \leq s, \\ +1, & i > s, \end{cases}$$

and write $\mathcal{N}$ for the set of vectors $\mathbf{n} = (n_4, \dots, n_{2s}) \in (\mathbb{N} \cap [1, cB])^{2s-3}$. For any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ we define the surface

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}} : g(y_1) + g(y_2) - \epsilon_3 g(y_3) = \sum_{i=4}^{2s} \epsilon_i g(n_i).$$

Let $\mathcal{N}_1$ be the set of $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ for which $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is singular, and let $\mathcal{N}_2 = \mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{N}_1$. Clearly $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is non-singular, and so absolutely irreducible, for $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_2$. Our first task is to establish the following result, which ensures that the same is true for $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1$.

Lemma 2. *The surface $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is absolutely irreducible for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1$, and we have $\#\mathcal{N}_1 = O_f(B^{2s-4})$.*

Proof. Suppose that (ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3) is a singular point of the surface $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$, for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1$. Then it follows that $\frac{dg}{dx}$ vanishes at ξ_i for $1 \leq i \leq 3$, and that

$$g(\xi_1) + g(\xi_2) - \epsilon_3 g(\xi_3) = \sum_{i=4}^{2s} \epsilon_i g(n_i). \quad (7)$$

Since $\frac{dg}{dx}$ is a polynomial of degree $d-1$, it follows that there are at most $(d-1)^3$ possible singular points $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ on the surface $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$. This establishes that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is absolutely irreducible. Indeed, if we had a non-trivial decomposition of the form

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}} = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \subset \mathbb{A}^3,$$

then Γ_1 and Γ_2 would necessarily intersect in a variety of dimension at least 1. Since every point of this set would produce a singular point in the surface $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$, this would contradict the fact that it has finite singular locus.

It therefore remains to count the number of $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ for which (7) holds, for $O_d(1)$ values of (ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3) . But if we fix a choice of (ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3) and $(n_5, \dots, n_{2s})$, then there can clearly only be $O_d(1)$ values of n_4 such that (7) holds. Hence it follows that there are $O_f(B^{2s-4})$ values of $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ has singularity (ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3) . This suffices to establish the second part of the lemma. $\square$

Let $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$ denote the number of positive integers $y_1, y_2, y_3 \ll_f B$, that lie on the surface $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$, with the constraint that $y_3 \notin \{y_1, y_2\}$ whenever $s = 2$. Then in order to estimate $S_s(B)$, it will suffice to estimate $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$ for each $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$, since we clearly have

$$S_s(B) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1} S_s(B; \mathbf{n}) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_2} S_s(B; \mathbf{n}). \quad (8)$$

In estimating $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$ it will prove necessary to pay special attention to the points lying on curves of low degree contained in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$.

Lemma 3. *For any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}$, there is no contribution to $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$ from any lines or conics contained in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ that are defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof. We begin by considering the possibility that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ contains a line defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, and we write $c_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{i=4}^{2s} \epsilon_i g(n_i)$ for convenience. Thus there exist $\lambda_i, \mu_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that the polynomial

$$g(\lambda_1 t + \mu_1) + g(\lambda_2 t + \mu_2) - \epsilon_3 g(\lambda_3 t + \mu_3) - c_{\mathbf{n}}$$

vanishes identically. We may clearly assume that at most one λ_i is zero, since otherwise it is easy to see that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$. Suppose first that $\lambda_1 \neq 0$. Then after a possible change of variables we may assume that $\lambda_1 = 1$ and $\mu_1 = 0$. Upon recalling the shape (4) that g takes, it therefore follows that

$$1 + \lambda_2^d = \epsilon_3 \lambda_3^d.$$

Wiles' proof [5, Theorem 0.5] of Fermat's Last Theorem shows that $\lambda_2 \lambda_3 = 0$. If $\lambda_3 = 0$, then d must be odd and $\lambda_2 = -1$. We must now consider the possibility that we have an identity of the shape $g(t) + g(-t + \mu_2) = k_{\mathbf{n}}$, for some constant $k_{\mathbf{n}}$. Upon examining the coefficient of t^{d-1} , we conclude from (4) that $\mu_2 = 0$. In terms of the original coordinates we have shown that this case produces the affine line $y_1 = -y_2, y_3 = \mu_3$, provided that d is odd. Although this line may be contained in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ for certain choices of g , such solutions actually contribute nothing to $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$ since we are only interested in positive integer points on $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$. Next we suppose that $\lambda_2 = 0$ and $\lambda_3^d = \epsilon_3$. If $\epsilon_3 = -1$ then the previous argument can be repeated to yield the line $y_1 = -y_3, y_2 = \mu_2$, which shows that this case also contributes nothing to $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$. If $\epsilon_3 = 1$ however, so that $s = 2$, then either $\lambda_3 = -1$ and d is even, or else $\lambda_3 = 1$. In the former case we obtain the line $y_1 = -y_3, y_2 = \mu_2$, and in the latter case we obtain the line $y_1 = y_3, y_2 = \mu_2$. Neither of these cases contribute anything to $S_2(B; \mathbf{n})$, since we must have $y_3 \notin \{y_1, y_2\}$ whenever $s = 2$. Upon treating the case corresponding to $\lambda_1 = 0$ in a similar fashion, one is led to the pair of lines $y_1 = \mu_1, y_2 = \pm y_3$. Neither of these contribute anything to $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$.

Next we suppose that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ contains a conic defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Thus there exist $\kappa_i, \lambda_i, \mu_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that the polynomial

$$g(\kappa_1 t^2 + \lambda_1 t + \mu_1) + g(\kappa_2 t^2 + \lambda_2 t + \mu_2) - \epsilon_3 g(\kappa_3 t^2 + \lambda_3 t + \mu_3) - c_{\mathbf{n}}$$

vanishes identically. Suppose that $\kappa_1 \neq 0$, say, and let

$$h(y) = \kappa_1^d g(y/\kappa_1) = y^d + b_2 \kappa_1^2 y^{d-2} + \cdots + b_{d-1} \kappa_1^{d-1} y.$$

Then after a possible relabelling of variables it suffices to consider the vanishing of the polynomial

$$h(t^2 + \mu_1) + h(\kappa_2 t^2 + \lambda_2 t + \mu_2) - \epsilon_3 h(\kappa_3 t^2 + \lambda_3 t + \mu_3) - \kappa_1^d c_{\mathbf{n}}.$$

Upon examining the coefficient of the leading monomial t^{2d} , we deduce that

$$1 + \kappa_2^d = \epsilon_3 \kappa_3^d,$$

and so $\kappa_2 \kappa_3 = 0$. If $\kappa_3 = 0$ then d must be odd and $\kappa_2 = -1$. Using the fact that the coefficient of t^{2d-1} must also vanish, we further deduce that $\lambda_2 = 0$. Similarly, the coefficient of t^{2d-2} is equal to $d(\mu_1 + \mu_2)$ since d is odd, from which it follows that $\mu_2 = -\mu_1$. Again appealing to the fact that d is odd, we finally deduce that $\lambda_3 = 0$ by considering the coefficient of t^d . In terms of the original coordinates we therefore have

$$y_1 = t^2 + \mu_1 = -y_2, \quad y_3 = \mu_3,$$

and it is clear that such solutions contribute nothing to $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$. Alternatively, if $\kappa_2 = 0$ then $\kappa_3^d = \epsilon_3$. Arguing as above it suffices to assume that $\epsilon_3 = 1$, and so that $s = 2$. But then the same analysis ultimately leads to solutions of the form

$$y_1 = t^2 + \mu_1 = y_3, \quad y_2 = \mu_2,$$

which are not permissible. The case $\kappa_1 = 0, \kappa_2 \neq 0$ is handled similarly. This completes the proof of Lemma 3. $\square$

The remainder of this section is taken up with establishing the following result.

Lemma 4. *Assume that Hypothesis $[d, \theta_d]$ holds. Then we have*

$$S_s(B; \mathbf{n}) \ll_{\epsilon, f} \begin{cases} B^{2/\sqrt{d}+1/3+\epsilon}, & \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1, \\ B^{1/3+\epsilon} + B^{\theta_d+\epsilon}, & \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 4 will hinge upon work of Heath-Brown [2, Theorem 14]. Let $\|\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}\|$ denote the maximum modulus of the coefficients of the polynomial defining $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$, so that in particular $\log \|\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}\| = O_f(\log B)$ for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$. Now let (y_1, y_2, y_3) be any point counted by $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$, and note that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is absolutely irreducible for $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2$ by Lemma 2. Therefore an application of [2, Theorem 14] implies that (y_1, y_2, y_3) lies on one of at most

$$\ll_{\epsilon, f} B^{2/\sqrt{d}+\epsilon} \|\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}\|^\epsilon \ll_{\epsilon, f} B^{2/\sqrt{d}+\epsilon}$$

proper subvarieties of $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$, each of degree $O_{\varepsilon,d}(1)$. We remark that it is actually possible to make the assumption $\log \|\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}\| = O_{\varepsilon,d}(\log B)$ at this stage, by employing the argument of [2, Theorem 4]. When $a_1 = 0$ in (2) this would lead to the uniformity result mentioned after the statement of Theorem 3.

It remains to estimate the number of points of bounded height lying on $O_{\varepsilon,f}(B^{2/\sqrt{d}+\varepsilon})$ absolutely irreducible curves of degree $O_{\varepsilon,d}(1)$ that are contained in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$. For this we use Lemma 1. Suppose first that $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1$. Then Lemma 3 implies that we may ignore points lying on any curves of degree at most 2 that are defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Any curve of degree at most 2 that is not defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ clearly contains only $O(1)$ points. Hence it follows from Lemma 1 that

$$S_s(B; \mathbf{n}) \ll_{\varepsilon,f} B^{2/\sqrt{d}+1/3+\varepsilon},$$

whenever $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_1$.

Suppose now that $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}_2$. Then on the assumption that Hypothesis $[d, \theta_d]$ holds, we obtain the overall contribution $O_{\varepsilon,f}(B^{\theta_d+\varepsilon})$ from points not contained on any curve of degree at most $d-2$ that is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. It remains to consider the contribution to $S_s(B; \mathbf{n})$ from the curves of degree at most $d-2$, that are defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ and are contained in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$. Since $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ is non-singular we may apply a result of Colliot-Thélène [2, Appendix]. We conclude that $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$ contains $O_d(1)$ curves of degree $\leq d-2$. Lemma 3 implies that we may ignore points lying on those curves of degree at most 2. Hence Lemma 1 yields the overall contribution $O_{\varepsilon,f}(B^{1/3+\varepsilon})$ from the curves of degree at most $d-2$ contained in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{n}}$. This completes the proof of Lemma 4. $\square$

Recall the estimate in Lemma 2 for $\#\mathcal{N}_1$, and note that $\#\mathcal{N}_2 = O_f(B^{2s-3})$. Then we may combine Lemma 4 and (8) to deduce that

$$S_s(B) \ll_{\varepsilon,f} B^{2s-3+\varepsilon} \left(B^{1/3} + B^{\theta_d} \right), \quad (9)$$

since $d \geq 4$.

2.2 Estimating $T_s(B)$

In this section we shall study the quantity $T_s(B)$. Under the assumption that Hypothesis $[d, \theta_d]$ holds, our aim is to establish the inequality

$$T_s(B) \ll_{\varepsilon,f} B^{2s-3+\varepsilon} \left(B^{1/3} + B^{\theta_d} \right), \quad (10)$$

for any $s \geq 2$. We shall argue by induction on s .

In order to handle the base case $s = 2$, it will suffice to estimate the contribution to $T_2(B)$ from those y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4 for which $y_1 = y_3$, say. There are then $O_f(B)$ choices for y_1, y_3 , and it remains to count the number of positive integers $y_2, y_4 \ll_f B$ such that $y_2 \neq y_4$ and

$$g(y_2) = g(y_4). \quad (11)$$

This equation defines a curve of degree d in $\mathbb{A}^2$. We claim that those points lying on curves of degree at most 2, that form components of (11) and are defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, contribute nothing to $T_2(B)$. This is established along exactly the same lines as the proof of Lemma 3, and so we will be brief. Suppose

first that there exist $\lambda, \mu, \lambda', \mu' \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $g(\lambda t + \mu) = g(\lambda' t + \mu')$ vanishes identically. After a possible change of variables we may assume without loss of generality that $\lambda' = 1$ and $\mu' = 0$. By equating coefficients it therefore follows from (4) that $\lambda = \pm 1$ and $\mu = 0$. Neither of these cases contribute anything to $T_2(B)$. The case in which (11) contains a conic defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ is despatched in precisely the same way. Thus it remains to estimate the contribution from the remaining absolutely irreducible components of (11). An application of Lemma 1 therefore yields the overall contribution $O_{\varepsilon, f}(B^{1/3+\varepsilon})$ to $T_2(B)$. This establishes that $T_2(B) = O_{\varepsilon, f}(B^{4/3+\varepsilon})$, which is satisfactory for (10).

Suppose now that $s > 2$. But then it is trivial to see that we have

$$T_s(B) \ll \sum_{y \ll_f B} (S_{s-1}(B) + T_{s-1}(B)).$$

Applying the induction hypothesis, in conjunction with (9), therefore yields

$$T_s(B) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} \sum_{y \ll_f B} B^{2s-5+\varepsilon} (B^{1/3} + B^{\theta_d}) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} B^{2s-3+\varepsilon} (B^{1/3} + B^{\theta_d}).$$

This completes the proof of (10).

2.3 Completion of the proof

Assume that Hypothesis $[d, \theta_d]$ holds. Then it remains to combine (9) and (10) in (5) and (6), to conclude that

$$M_s^{(0)}(f; B) \leq S_s(B) + T_s(B) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} B^{2s-3+\varepsilon} (B^{1/3} + B^{\theta_d}).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

References

- [1] T.D. Browning and D.R. Heath-Brown. Equal sums of three powers, *Invent. Math.*, 157 (2004), 553–573.
- [2] D.R. Heath-Brown. The density of rational points on curves and surfaces, *Ann. of Math.*, 155 (2002), 553–595.
- [3] L.K. Hua. On Waring’s problem, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.*, 9 (1938), 199–202.
- [4] J. Pila. Density of integral and rational points on varieties, *Astérisque*, 228 (1995), 183–187.
- [5] A. Wiles. Modular elliptic curves and Fermat’s last theorem, *Ann. of Math.*, 141 (1995), 443–551.
- [6] R.C. Vaughan and T.D. Wooley. Further improvements in Waring’s problem. IV. Higher powers, *Acta Arith.*, 94 (2000), 203–285.
- [7] T.D. Wooley. Sums and differences of two cubic polynomials, *Monatsh. Math.*, 129 (2000), 159–169.